#### CLEAN AIR ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting of the Subcommittee on Linking Land Use, Transportation, and Air Quality Monday, April 26, 1999

Portland Marriott Downtown 1401 SW Naito Parkway Portland, Oregon 97201

Gay MacGregor, EPA-OMS, and Bob Wyman, Latham and Watkins, called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. After the attendees introduced themselves, the minutes from the previous meeting were formally accepted by the Subcommittee.

## **Conformity Issues**

Ms. MacGregor began the meeting with a brief presentation on a recent court decision on the 1997 conformity rule. She informed the group that on March 2, 1999, the court ruled in favor of the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) in the lawsuit brought against EPA regarding its third set of conformity amendments. Ms. MacGregor mentioned that both the court opinion and the dissent were lengthy, and that EPA is in the process of interpreting the court opinion so that it can develop workable solutions. The court addressed the issue of EPA's previous method of grandfathering transportation projects during a conformity lapse, ruling that it was not legal under the Clean Air Act. (Ms. MacGregor indicated that this finding could have an effect on various other suits currently being processed, such as those in Atlanta.) EPA has interpreted the court opinion to say that the appropriate point of grandfathering is at the point of funding commitment, which is considered to be a contractual obligation with the state or local area to be able to spend federal funds on transportation projects. Ms. MacGregor added that although the ruling is retroactive, very few projects are likely to be disrupted because almost all areas around the country that are currently in lapse will be coming out of lapse shortly.

Ms. MacGregor reminded the Subcommittee that the third set of conformity amendments allows a submitted state implementation plan (SIP) and its budget to be used for conformity purposes if (1) the SIP has been in the Agency for 45 days and (2) EPA either determines the SIP to be adequate by letter or does not speak. The court ruled, however, that EPA must make a finding of adequacy (i.e., the Agency cannot be silent). Further, the petitioners have requested that there be public process in the determination of adequacy. As a result, EPA has worked with

Ms. MacGregor further mentioned that DOJ, DOT, and EPA have decided not to appeal the court decision. The agencies feel that an appeal would be unlikely to succeed and that further interpretation of the rule by the court may even remove some of the flexibility that EPA has identified. She also stressed that the picture is not as bleak as lobbyists are making it out to be.

Ms. MacGregor stated her expectation that there will be some sort of legislative riders on appropriations bills. At least one is expected to come out this summer codifying the third set of conformity amendments' grandfathering position at the point of NEPA review.

Ms. MacGregor stressed her belief that EPA has a workable solution here, and informed the Subcommittee that the Agency will soon be coming out with guidance that addresses SIP adequacy. She noted that the guidance is meant only to help in the interim and that EPA intends to propose regulations as soon as possible. Ms. MacGregor also stressed that EPA would take comments on the guidance it plans to issue and hopes to have the final regulations published by the end of December 1999. Ms. MacGregor concluded by noting that almost all of the SIPs that are in EPA that have not been approved but whose budgets have been used for conformity will be found to be adequate officially by notice in the *Federal Register* by the end of May.

### **Questions and Comments**

• Herb Williams, Texas National Resource Conservation Commission, asked whether a formal approval of the SIP would now be required in addition to the finding of adequacy. Ms. MacGregor responded that no formal approval would be required. The process will remain the same with the possibility of a public comment period being added in the future. Mr. Williams also asked about the length of the public comment period. Ms. MacGregor responded that the period would most likely be 30 days in length, and added that the public would have the chance to comment on the finding of adequacy but not on the criteria used in the determination. Mr. Williams questioned Ms. MacGregor about what would happen if EPA received negative comments during the public comment period, and wondered if EPA would extend the process to answer the public's concerns. Ms. MacGregor responded that EPA would be sure to address the comments. Finally, in response to Mr. Williams' questions and concerns about areas that have been in attainment for the old ozone standards but will be in non-attainment for the new standards, Ms. MacGregor noted that there will likely be a rule (or "test") for transitional areas and referred Mr. Williams to two of her associates to discuss the issue in further detail.

• Mike Mittelholzer, NAHB, asked about the number of areas currently in a conformity lapse. Ms. MacGregor responded that there are ten cities currently in lapse but that all of them should be coming out of lapse within a few weeks. She also noted that only projects that were issued a funding commitment during a lapse would be in jeopardy of losing that funding based on the retroactive nature of the court's ruling.

# Report from the Quantification Workgroup (John Hall, EPA-OMS, and Steve Gerritson, Sierra Club)

After introducing the Quantification Workgroup Members to the Subcommittee, Steve Gerritson, Sierra Club, briefly listed Workgroup activities that have taken place since the last Subcommittee meeting. He explained that the Quantification Workgroup is currently working on three tasks -- a spreadsheet model using localized data to calculate benefits of transportation control measures (TCMs), a workbook for the model, and six TCM documents. He referred the Subcommittee members to a handout, "Benefits Estimates for Selected TCM Programs," as an example of what the Workgroup does. Mr. Gerritson also mentioned that the Quantification Workgroup would be meeting with Sierra Research later in the evening to discuss the spreadsheet model and the workbook.

John Hall, EPA-OMS, informed the Subcommittee that the handout is based on a 1994 methodology. He noted that the spreadsheet will follow a new methodology that is more closely related to the regional transportation modeling process. Mr. Hall also stated that a portion of the Workgroup's time is spent comparing the two methodologies. Mr. Gerritson added that these documents would be very helpful in standardizing the quantification process and in moving toward allowing credit for TCMs and other similar programs. Further, he emphasized that as traditional remedies are exhausted, non-traditional methods will be the only way to move forward.

### **Questions and Comments**

• Mr. Wyman asked if the results of the methodology outlined in the handout were at all surprising. Mr. Gerritson responded that there were no surprises because it is an older (i.e., 1994) methodology. Mr. Wyman also asked about peer review of the distributed document. Ms. MacGregor responded that the document had not been peer reviewed by the Workgroup because of its late release. (However, the 1994 guidance upon which the

- Mr. Mittelholzer asked whether the new methodology would incorporate new algorithms and more recent EPA research, or whether the spreadsheet would also be based on the 1994 work. Mr. Hall responded that the spreadsheet is a different methodology, although it is similar to the 1994 methodology in that it involves a four-step process.
- Michael Ball, EPA-OMS, mentioned EPA's workshop on voluntary measures that will take place in Dallas, Texas, on June 24-25. He noted that issues along the lines of the Quantification Workgroup's work will be discussed at the workshop. Alex Johnson, Delta Institute, asked for whom the Dallas workshop is intended. Mr. Ball responded that it is focused towards associations, planners, and traditional air quality stakeholders, but asked for further input on who might be interested. Mr. Johnson explained that there is a need to inform a larger group than this. He also pointed out the potential to address the emerging program on urban air toxics in such a setting, and asked if there have been any efforts to quantify the benefits of such a program. Ms. MacGregor responded that EPA is in the process of trying to quantify toxics and that, although EPA has not yet been able to accurately quantify reductions, it is generally recognized that reducing VOCs will address toxics as well. She also commented that air toxics is one of the main focal points of the 2001 budget.
- Bill Goldsmith, Cornell University, commented that what is missing in the modeling is an
  adequate discussion of what drives land use patterns (other than transportation itself.) He
  noted that the results could be dramatically different, and expressed an interest in seeing
  EPA do additional work on this issue. Mr. Gerritson agreed with Mr. Goldsmith, and
  noted that EPA has recognized this need and that there is a land use modeling effort
  underway now.
- Mr. Paul called the Subcommittee's attention to airport expansions as another cause of increased emissions. Mr. Ball commented that there was a recent summit held on this matter. Ms. MacGregor added that, as a result of this summit, EPA will be working with Salt Lake City on its airport. Mr. Ball mentioned that EPA is working with airlines at the national level on a voluntary initiative, and is also working with metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and airport authorities to look at activity within and around airports.
- Mr. Ball circulated a pamphlet of the new materials coming out of EPA's TRAO Center.

Clive Rock, Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority (GVTA), began by giving a brief overview of his presentation. He then briefly described the institutional environment in and around Vancouver. He described the make-up of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD), explaining that it is a partnership of 20 cities, is about 2,000 square kilometers in size (three times the size of metropolitan Toronto), and has a population of approximately 1.9 million residents. The responsibilities of the GVRD include air quality planning, strategic planning, water and sewer utilities, solid waste, and regional parks.

Mr. Rock informed the Subcommittee that Translink was introduced to the GVRD on April 1, 1999. Translink is responsible for all transit and major roads in the region and is required by statute to have a demand management program. It is also responsible for all of the emission testing and even operates some car ferries on the river.

Mr. Rock directed the Subcommittee's attention to an aerial map of Vancouver, pointing out the more densely developed downtown area and the outlying vicinity that has been subject to a great deal of sprawl. He then noted a few transit-use facts for Vancouver:

- There are approximately 124 million linked trips per year;
- There are approximately 63 transit rides per resident per year;
- The #9 Broadway bus carries 55,000 passengers per day;
- The transit system has about 50 percent of the market share into downtown;
- 51 percent of transit costs are recovered from fares; and
- There is significant unmet demand for transit.

Mr. Rock mentioned that although Vancouver has no freeways, the car population in the region is growing at a rate of three per hour, 24 hours a day. As a result, Vancouver has concerns about pollution and is the only jurisdiction in Canada to have emission testing. Mr. Rock also noted that, because there is little heavy industry in the area, mobile sources contribute the greatest amount to Vancouver's pollution problem.

Mr. Rock gave a brief description of the GVRD Air Shed, explaining that it is shared by Vancouver and Whatcom County. He noted that GVRD has an integrated approach to growth management planning that encompasses air quality, land use, and transportation in one plan (the "Livable Region Strategic Plan"). Mr. Rock explained that the plan is a provincial law that Vancouver must follow and is an attempt to protect the Green Zone, to build complete.

Mr. Rock mentioned that although transit use dominates 50 percent of the market into the downtown area, the region-wide transit share is only 13 percent. He indicated that GVRD's goal is to increase this share to 18 percent by 2021, an effort that will require major investment in transit and roads and significant demand management measures. Mr. Rock pointed out that GVRD plans to use TDM to reduce peak-hour vehicle trips by 10 percent by 2021 and stated that, without TDM, GVRD will not reach its 18 percent goal for transit's share of travel by 2021. He further indicated that GVRD plans to use TDM to pay (in part) for transit expansion.

Mr. Rock admitted that one problem Vancouver has faced has been that GVRD has had many good plans but was previously not acting on them. GVRD concluded that its problems were both institutional and financial, and needed to develop the right instruments to get everyone to agree and work together. GVRD determined that to be successful it would have to bring transit, roads, demand management, and funding under the control of one group. After a few years of negotiations, the new regional authority (GVTA) was put in place on April 1, 1999.

Mr. Rock indicated that the GVTA is unique to Canada and has developed an integrated approach to transit, roads, TDM, and financing. Most of GVTA's funding comes from transportation sources in the region (e.g., fares, gasoline taxes, tolls). Mr. Rock reiterated that GVTA is required by statute to support growth management and the Air Quality Plan.

Mr. Rock next explained that the GVTA Board consists of 15 members, 12 of whom are local (mayors or GVRD directors) and three of whom are provincial (MLAs or ministers). GVTA's four program areas are transit, TDM, major roads, and Air Care (GVRD's emission program). Mr. Rock listed the transit areas controlled by GVTA, which include the bus system, rapid transit, SeaBus, commuter rail, and services for the disabled.

Mr. Rock indicated that GVTA's business plan is to position itself as the connection between all of the transit systems, the services of which will be contracted out to be run by separate providers. Mr. Rock cited the lack of major roads as a problem that GVTA is currently working on. He informed the Subcommittee that before GVTA there was no regional road system and, as a result, there are currently many pressures on the road system. GVTA is preparing a growth plan that will manage growth based on "people-moving capacity" rather than "car capacity." After determining the number of people it aims to move, GVTA will create a road system to serve that capacity, without a major expansion of the road system.

distances traveled and the fact that they often originate from a cold start. Further, Mr. Rock pointed out that car trips to school promote the wrong kind of transit practices to children of an impressionable age.

Mr. Rock briefly discussed GVTA's emission program. He stated the need to educate the public and to combat the current misconception that when a car passes an inspection it means that vehicle no longer pollutes. Mr. Rock then listed some of GVTA's goals for the future, which include doubling the size of the transit system by 2009, coordinating their road system, and increasing their TDM efforts. Mr. Rock stressed that to meet these goals GVTA will need a significant subsidy, and noted that most of GVTA's current funding sources are transportation-based, including fares, the gas tax, parking taxes, and vehicle levies. Mr. Rock indicated that there is public support on these tolls and charges as long as the funds go directly back into transit.

Mr. Rock next summarized the public mood in Vancouver on transit issues. He explained that there is a general sense of driving on borrowed time. The public wants better alternatives to car transportation, though they do not really understand or seem to want to be involved in the government process of solving the problem. The public also has a high understanding of environmental issues and is willing to accept the concept of "the user pays." Finally, there is a general understanding of the need for a balanced approach to phasing the automobile out of everyday transit.

Mr. Rock briefly commented on Canada's commitment to the Kyoto Protocol, stating that Canada intends to reduce greenhouse gases to six percent below 1990 levels by 2010. Mr. Rock indicated that he is involved in the collaborative effort between the federal government and the provinces to create a reduction strategy by December 1999. He also noted that, to accomplish its goal, Vancouver would need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the urban transportation sector by 35 percent, which might not be possible.

Mr. Rock continued by stating a few observations on reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. He emphasized that technology (e.g., clean vehicles) offers a means to achieving a big reduction but that only modest reductions will be possible by expanding transit. He stressed that Vancouver must focus on long-term changes such as urban form and shifting to a "user-pay" transit system due to its limited ability to subsidize all urban transportation.

## **Questions and Comments**

- Bill Donahue, Sunoco, asked if Canada has a reformulated gasoline program and if Mr. Rock's concern about Canadians buying their gasoline in Washington State was an economic or environmental concern. Mr. Rock responded that it is an economic concern, and stressed that it becomes very difficult to effectively tax gasoline when so many Canadians live within five or ten miles of the United States border. Mr. Rock noted that Canada has some cleaner fuels and that Canada also has quite a few gas stations that sell natural gas.
- Ms. MacGregor asked Mr. Rock to comment on how GVRD integrates its transportation and air quality plans. Mr. Rock responded that although statutory regional planning did not exist until 1995, 20 cities decided themselves to voluntarily work together to develop plans. These cities then requested that the provincial government put this collaboration into statutory form.
- Jane Nishida, Maryland Department of the Environment, asked if Canada confronts any other sources of pollution stemming from the Pacific Northwest besides the emissions from gas purchased in the United States by Canadians. She also asked if there are any efforts to bilaterally deal with these issues. Mr. Rock reiterated that Canadians purchasing gasoline in the United States is not an environmental issue. He also remarked that the United States is not the source of Vancouver's pollution problems because the pollution is primarily from mobile sources, and stressed that Canadians who buy gas from the United States would be using gas and polluting the air in Canada anyway.
- Mr. Paul asked what provisions GVRD is making in its long-term planning for changes in technology (e.g., electric cars make the need for gasoline, and thus the benefits derived from the gas tax, obsolete). Mr. Rock responded that some minor changes might be made but that in general the same land use solutions would be pursued with or without changes in technology. He stated that car traffic puts pressure on Vancouver in other ways, including the reduction of green space, increase in sprawl, and the reduction of community. Mr. Paul also asked if there is interaction between provincial and municipal governments on land use issues. Mr. Rock answered that the provincial government has a Department of Municipal Affairs that signs off on the growth management plans for different areas but that the role of this department is fairly passive. He also noted that,

- combat those of the past. Mr. Rock responded that GVRD plans to expand the rail system as a potential solution. Specifically, GVRD intends to densify development along the rail lines and, in particular, to increase the amount of employment along the rail lines.
- Bill Auberle, Northern Arizona University, stated his interest in learning more about the reasons for creating the GVTA as a second powerful entity, rather than integrating it within GVRD. Further, he asked if there is enough agreement on the issues between the two entities to be sure that land use and transportation will be worked on together. Mr. Rock responded by explaining that the majority of GVTA board of directors are appointees from the regional government board. They were set up separately to avoid giving the impression that GVRD was a "big brother" operation. He stated that it is very much a cooperative relationship between the municipalities and the region. Mr. Rock also noted that, because of competing demands in the region, legislation requires that the regional government sign off on any new financial measures for the GVTA.
- Mr. Johnson asked how effective GVTA's efforts have been to use emission testing as a means to educate car owners about pollution issues. Mr. Rock responded that GVTA does not formally take over emission testing until September 1, 1999, and that their intentions have not yet been realized. They intend to use emission testing as an opportunity to expose people to alternatives. Mr. Rock stressed that Vancouver's problem is that their transit systems are full and need to be expanded, not that they need to recruit new mass transit patrons. Mr. Johnson also asked if people are willing to pay more for transit even if their money does not go directly to the mode of transit that they use. Mr. Rock replied that the public interest is in expanding the transit system overall.
- Ms. MacGregor referred back to Mr. Rock's earlier discussion of transportation funding, asking if this funding is drawn entirely from provincial and local government sources. Mr. Rock responded that this is the case, and noted that GVTA tried unsuccessfully to attain the authority to raise funds locally.
- A number of Subcommittee members expressed an interest in discussing further GVTA's
  "doctor's check-up" approach to emission testing. Mr. Goldsmith commented on the
  issue of whether passing an emission test actually means the car is helping to reduce air
  pollution. Ms. MacGregor added that most emission tests are designed to fix only the
  worst problems.

Matt Borick, ICF, continued the discussion by giving a brief overview of the awards program and two documents -- the proposal for the Clean Air Excellence Awards Program and the draft "Clean Air Excellence Awards Program 1999 Entry Package" -- that had been distributed to the Subcommittee.

Mr. Wyman mentioned a few key issues for the Subcommittee to think about during the discussion. He reminded them that a panel of judges will soon need to be selected from the full CAAAC. Mr. Wyman also solicited suggestions from the Subcommittee on individuals with expertise in particular subject areas that EPA could call on to offer insight during the award selection process.

#### **Ouestions and Comments**

- Chuck Collett, NAHB, informed the Subcommittee that he would have to speak with the NAHB executive board to get a consensus before NAHB agreed to help sponsor the program. He also commented that limiting eligibility to the United States is a good idea for the first two to five years of the program but asked that the Subcommittee remain open-minded about expanding eligibility to an international level in the future. Mr. Borick mentioned that a program evaluation is already planned three years into the program, and agreed that this eligibility expansion could be one of the issues considered during the evaluation.
- Paul Rasmussen, EPA-OAR, stated the interest some have expressed in the level of recognition that will come with the award. It was agreed that in the three-year period before the evaluation the Subcommittee would look closely at the kinds of proposals being received and whether the program is working effectively. At the end of three years, consideration would be given to whether or not to increase the level of recognition associated with the program. The decision was also made to begin the award process now and to give further consideration to particular aspects of the program in three years.
- Mr. Collett cautioned the awards committee not to set their expectations too high. He also mentioned that he has previous experience sitting on a panel of judges and offered to participate as a judge for the Clean Air Excellence Awards Program as well. Mr. Wyman responded that the awards committee would appreciate all of the help it can get.

identified. Mr. Mittelholzer responded by expressing his hope that in the first year of the program, the judging panel will focus on the areas in which there is group consensus. Mr. Borick added that specific linkages between vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and land use were excluded from the land use area specifically to address NAHB's concerns. Mr. Wyman clarified that the awards committee is still very open to rewarding programs that work to reduce VMT.

- Mr. Donahue asked if corporations or regulated entities would be eligible for the award, and if existing technology could be rewarded. (Mr. Wyman answered affirmatively to each question.) Mr. Donahue added that the community stakeholder contingency at a recent Reinventing Government stakeholders meeting voiced their belief that the community involved in the effort that is rewarded should be rewarded as well.
- Mr. Rasmussen briefly stated the upcoming schedule for getting the awards program underway. He expressed the importance of securing a stellar group of submissions the first time around, even if it means extending the planned time line. He stressed using the CAAAC members to help get the message out. The consensus of the Subcommittee was to move forward with the awards program whether or not it fits exactly into the currently proposed time line.

### Land Use Policy Options Paper Update (John Hall, EPA Office of Mobile Sources)

John Hall, EPA-OMS, began his presentation by stating EPA's goal to complete a draft land use SIP policy by the end of 1999. He then gave a brief overview of what the policy will contain. EPA wants the policy to provide a context by including a general description of policies, advantages and issues involved, a description of who will use the guidance, and links to the TRAQ Center. In addition, the policy will contain policy options and more descriptive quantification guidance. To date, EPA has identified three potential ways in which to credit beneficial land use programs. The first option is baseline quantification. Second, the credit could be incorporated directly into the SIP by using the economic incentives program (EIP) guidance or the voluntary measures policy. Finally, the credit could be integrated through the conformity process.

mentioned that it would be appropriate for some public information programs as well. Mr. Hall stressed that some aspect of the program, whether it is the incentive or the actions taken themselves, must be enforceable by the state. Further, the state must estimate compliance and programmatic uncertainty. Finally, Mr. Hall noted that there is a relatively short time horizon for the EIP Guidance if used in an attainment plan.

Crediting through the voluntary measures policy is particularly appropriate for programs implemented by a third party. Mr. Hall mentioned that the state is required to commit to emissions reductions and must make up for any reductions that are not attained as planned, although the state is not responsible for the actions themselves. Mr. Hall noted that the three percent cap on credited reductions could be perceived as limiting by some states if they have other programs they want to implement. Mr. Hall pointed out that the voluntary measures policy also requires states to estimate compliance and programmatic uncertainty, and noted that the time horizon here is relatively short if used in an attainment plan.

Mr. Hall continued by briefly discussing maintenance plans, which require an area to account for future increases in emissions after attainment has been reached. Originally, states are required to have a 10-year plan and then a second 10-year plan after eight years have passed. Mr. Hall noted that the longer time frame may make this option a more appropriate way to credit land use measures, though many areas actually may not need additional mobile source measures.

Mr. Hall then stated some of the advantages of granting credit through the transportation conformity process. First, the longer time frame may make it a more appropriate way to credit land use measures. Further, the inter-agency consultation involved brings together relevant local, regional, and state agencies. Mr. Hall mentioned that conformity is linked to funding, which provides an incentive to local governments to find conformity measures. He noted that agencies may perceive less accountability with transportation conformity than with the SIP process, though this perception is not the reality. Like the SIP process, however, Mr. Hall cautioned that it may be difficult to detect double-counting within a transportation conformity framework.

Next, Mr. Hall briefly spoke about some quantification issues, stressing that accounting for changes in regional growth in an actual growth estimate (i.e., changing the baseline) may be both politically and technically difficult. He informed the Subcommittee that stakeholders want specific guidance on how to take credit for a measure. Further, he described the relationship between land use and emissions, stating that policies and programs first have an effect on urban

thus far it has been difficult to isolate the impacts of specific land use policies, but noted that the new policy will have the flexibility to incorporate new quantification research.

Mr. Hall concluded his presentation by listing the organizations EPA is working with to create the land use policy. They include state air quality agencies; metropolitan planning organizations and councils of governments; cities and local governments; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; and developers (including NAHB and Partnership for Advancement and Technology in Housing).

#### **Questions and Comments**

- Mr. Goldsmith asked how EPA plans to enforce incentives under the EIP Guidance. Mr.
  Hall agreed that it is impossible to enforce what the response to an incentive will be, but
  noted that EPA can enforce that an incentive is offered as it was proposed in the SIP. Mr.
  Johnson added that what EPA enforces is that benefits are achieved as promised.
- Mr. Goldsmith commended EPA for the areas it has chosen to try to quantify for the purpose of granting credit. He expressed his doubt, however, that EPA will be able to quantify in any reasonable way some of these areas (e.g., sidewalk width and land-use mixtures). Ms. MacGregor noted that one of the key issues is the level of credit that will be allowed, and stated that EPA is currently looking into these issues. Mr. Goldsmith also expressed his concern that a failure to adequately measure these contributions could undermine EPA's efforts to encourage these practices.
- Mr. Mittelholzer encouraged EPA to educate developers on both the new and the old policy and how the two relate to each other. He also voiced his concern about double-counting, and commented that he hopes this policy will be aimed at encouraging states to go above and beyond their current efforts rather than encouraging them to refine the numbers in their current plans. Finally, Mr. Mittelholzer commented that educating state and local agency staff members about this new policy will be a large and expensive effort to be completed within the year, and expressed his hope that EPA will continue to work collaboratively with NAHB in researching transportation models and land use. Ms. MacGregor responded that EPA's goal is to have a draft policy completed by the end of the year, not the final policy. She also noted that there will also be a lengthy public comment period.

Ms. MacGregor concluded the meeting by making a few final points. She mentioned that a number of tools have recently been emerging to help communities visualize their future growth (e.g., "Community 2020"). EPA has been considering the possibility of regional resource centers as a means of assisting communities in operating these tools. Ms. MacGregor distributed a draft document to the Subcommittee on how federal actors and other partners might be drawn together to help communities use these tools appropriately. Although EPA has chosen not to pursue this innovation, Ms. MacGregor asked for the Subcommittee's input nonetheless.

Ms. MacGregor also noted that the Sustainable America Town Meeting, at which many of EPA's current efforts will be featured, is scheduled for the week of May 3, 1999.

Ms. MacGregor and Mr. Wyman adjourned the Subcommittee meeting at 11:30 a.m.

## **ATTENDEES**

Name	Affiliation	Telephone Number
William Auberle	Northern Arizona University	520-523-5845
Michael Ball	EPA-OMS	734-214-4897
Matt Borick	ICF Inc.	703-218-2511
Chuck Collett	NAHB	319-332-6157
William Donahue	Sunoco, Inc.	215-246-8279
Anita Frankel	EPA, Region 10	206-553-2963
Steve Gerritson	Sierra Club	425-486-9784
Bill Goldsmith	Cornell University	607-255-2333
Greg Green	Oregon DEQ	503-229-5397
John Hall	EPA-OMS	734-214-4856
Brent Hunsberger	The Oregonian	503-221-8359
Alex Johnson	Delta Institute	312-554-0900
Gay MacGregor	EPA-OMS	734-214-4438
Michael Mittelholzer	NAHB	800-368-5246
Pat Mokhtarian	UC-Davis	530-752-7062
Jane Nishida	Maryland Department of the Environment	410-631-3084
John Paul	RAPCA	937-225-4435
Paul Rasmussen	EPA-OAR	202-260-6877
Clive Rock	GVTA	604-432-6377
Kelly Ross	Portland Home Builders Association	503-684-1880
Cathy Cowan Selesni	ck Clean Air Action Corporation	215-579-0514
Simon Washington	GIT	404-894-6476
Herb Williams	Texas National Resource Conservation Comm.	512-239-4884
Bob Wyman	Latham and Watkins	213-891-8334